DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 481 889 JC 030 566

TITLE	The Economic and Workforce Development Program (ED>Net) Annual Report, 2001-02 [and] Addendum to FY 01-02 Annual Report.
INSTITUTION	California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Economic Development Coordination Network (EDNet).
PUB DATE	2003-00-00
NOTE	15p.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text of Annual Report and Addendum (MS Word): http://www.cccco.edu/divisions/esed/ econdev/reports.htm.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Colleges; *Development; Economic Development; Educational Development; Labor Force; Labor Force Development; Labor Needs; Labor Supply; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

This document contains an annual report and its addendum from the Economic and Workforce Development Program of California Community Colleges. The annual report provides an overview of the Program's evaluation processes, regional centers, short-term projects, legislation, strategic plan, etc. It also provides vital facts about the program such as how the program brings in additional resources to the community colleges including thirty one million dollars in direct match for grants provided by businesses and industries. It also includes a summary of various data for the 2001-2002 year including job placements, businesses served, and credit and non-credit courses developed and offered. According to the report, significant improvements have been made in the welfare to work job placements and number of students served since 2000-2001 academic year. Areas that need improvement are number of employees served and number of businesses served. This document also contains an addendum to the report. The addendum gives more information about the following areas: (1) results comparison between regional centers and industry-driven regional collaborative; (2) funds provided to each regional center; (3) funding for industry driven-regional collaborative; (4) regional centers-instructions services; (5) industry driven regional collaborative-instruction services; and (6) industry driven regional collaborative: job placements, businesses served, and employees served. (MZ)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 481 889

The Economic and Workforce Development Program (ED>Net) Annual Report, 2001-02 [and] Addendum to FY 01-02 Annual Report

Economic & Workforce Development Program
California Community Colleges

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. Koehler

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

JC 030 566

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ECONOMIC & WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The Economic and Workforce Development Program (ED>Net)

Annual Report

2001-02

2A

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
ECONOMIC AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
MARCH 31, 2003

2001-2002 VITAL FACTS:

- One of three primary missions of the Community Colleges
  Education Code 66010.4 (a) (3) *A primary mission of the California Community Colleges is to advance California's economic growth and global competitiveness through education, training, and services that contribute to continuous work force improvement.*
- The only state leadership, planning and development fund for the community college system for economic and workforce development in higher education
- Reauthorized unanimously by the legislature through SB 1566 (Polanco, 2002)
- Brings in additional resources to the community colleges
  - $31 million in direct match for grants provided by business/industry.
  - Nearly all of the project dollars require a 1 to 1 match that can be from a variety of resources including in-kind sources from the college, federal grants, program income, etc. The ability of community college project directors to obtain business and industry match highlights the collaborative nature of the Program.
- This Program supports the classroom
  - 534 courses developed and offered;
  - 82,637 students served
- This Program supports the economy through economic and workforce development
  - 7,335 job placements
  - $100 million in sales increases (Small Business Development Centers)
  - $ 99 million in loans (Small Business Development Centers)
  - $ 18 million in sales, exports, imports (Centers for International Trade)
- Strategic Priority Areas support current employment needs and jobs of the future
  - A new, comprehensive report on the Regional Centers for Biotechnologies is available on our website that describes community college biotechnologies activities over the last five years (http://www.cccco.edu/divisions/esed/econdev/econdev.htm)
  - Regional Health Occupations Resource Centers support community college nursing programs, increasing nursing enrollments, and specialty nursing curriculum development.
  - Comprehensive operational reviews available on Regional Center activities in the following Initiative areas:
    - Manufacturing,
    - New media/ multimedia/entertainment,
    - Environmental (including hazardous materials operations training),
    - Advanced transportation (including fuel cell powered vehicles),
    - Small business development,
    - Workplace learning (includes ESL and VESL), and
    - International trade.

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
ECONOMIC AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
ANNUAL REPORT FOR 2001-2002

The 2000-2001 Annual Report provides a comprehensive description of the Economic and Workforce Development Program (Program) that is still valid for 2001-2002. The report described the Program's evaluation processes, regional centers, short-term projects, legislation, strategic plan, and other aspects of the Program. The report for 2001-2002 supplements the previous report with updates for 2001-2002 activities, expenditures and accomplishments.

As described in the 2000-2001 Annual Report, the Program conducts several layers of review, making improvements to the data collection methods while maintaining a concurrent system to summarize data over the fiscal year. This annual reporting system has remained relatively unchanged over the last few years. An at-a-glance report on the Program that describes activities, results and data is summarized on Table 1 below.

Table 1

Project Data Summary Form – Outcomes Information	2001-2002 Annual Report[1]
Matching resources from industry/business by grant	$ 31,085,547
Percentage of funds spent on instruction and workforce development	50%
Reported Job Placements – reported total by all grants	7,335
Job Placements - welfare to work[2] ($5 million Job Development Training Fund)	167
Businesses Served – reported total by all grants	39,659
Employees Served – reported total by all grants	86,830
Students Served – reported total by all grants	82,367
Credit/Non Credit Courses developed and offered	534
Contract Education Courses developed and offered	424
Contract Education students – grant related	15,639
Small Business Development Centers (SBDC)[3]	
Sales Increases	$ 191,576,454
701 Loans Funded	$ 99,998,216
Number of Jobs created (SBDCs only)	3,510
Jobs retained (SBDCs only)	4,557
Centers for International Trade (CITD)[4]	
Increased Business Value (sales, exports/imports, productivity)	$ 18,503,580

[1] Includes $1million for nursing curriculum development distributed amongst the Regional Health Occupations Resource Centers and the San Diego/Imperial Regional Consortia. Does not include outcomes of the $4 million augmentation to increase nursing enrollments, see section that follows for a report on nursing enrollments.
[2] Welfare hires identified separately in the on-line data collection system.
[3] SBDC information on sales, loans and jobs retained comes from data submitted for the Small Business Administration's accountability system. SBDCs reported job placements separately on the annual summary form.
[4] CITD information on sales/import increases comes from the on-line data collection system.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

As stated earlier, the Program has been making a series of improvements to the on-line data collection system. This system is an event-based system that fully describes activities and accomplishments. Data entry for the system began in January 2002 after beta testing. The data that has been gathered provides better information on outcomes such as "students placed in entry level positions" than what was previously collected. A sample of the data from the new system is below in Table 2.

Individual and Group Outcomes: Table 2	
Student/Employee received customized training	15,729
Student/Employee received basic skills training	2,644
Student/Employee completed college/ industry certification program	1,456
Jobs retained as a result of Program services[5]	1,428
Customized training resulted in career opportunity/advancement	1,042
Student/Employee placed in entry-level position	205
Number of Students placed in internships	195
Student/Employee promoted out of entry level position/management	83

The data shown on Table 1 and Table 2 both show significant accomplishments through the Program's activities. From year to year the Program has proven itself to be a significant contributor to the community college system, as well as the economy of California. Last year's external economic impact study showed a benefit-to-cost ratio of 12:1, and a return on investment in taxes of $2.64 for each dollar invested. Conducting the external impact study for three years in a row yielded similar, impressive economic impact years.

Table 3 below shows that the number of job placements, welfare-to-work job placements, students served, and number of credit/non-credit courses developed and offered have increased. Though there has been a significant decrease in the number of businesses served, there has only been a slight decrease in the number of employees served. The change in service to businesses may reflect the college system's emphasis on integrating the Program into the classroom. Budget cut proposals created instability in the centers, also. Whether the "student" is a current employee, or beginning a career path, they both may be seeking to improve their economic status.

Comparison between 2000-2001 and 2001-2002: Table 3			
	2001-2002	2000-2001	Percent change
Number of Job Placements	7,335	7,056	4%
Welfare to work job placements	167	50	234%
Number of businesses served	39,659	56,743	-30%
Number of employees served	86,830	93,667	-7%
Number of students served	82,367	29,932	175%
Number of credit/non-credit courses developed and offered	534	499	7%

[5]SBDCs report on another data collection system. See Table 1 for jobs retained and created.

FUNDING AND EXPENDITURES

For 2001-2002, the Economic and Workforce Development Program was funded at $50,172,000. This figure represented a $5 million increase over the previous year that consisted of $1 million for Specialty Nursing curriculum, and $4 million for increasing nursing enrollments. The remaining funds supported the Regional Centers and California-Mexico Trade Assistance Centers ($19.6 million), short-term grants ($21.4 million), and leadership/support activities including the reporting system ($4.1 million).

Table 2 summarizes expenditures by eligible activity, as described in *Education Code*. The *Education Code* does not limit the activities of the projects, but provides a description of ten types of activities that would meet the intent of the Program. Each grant can have unique accomplishments within the scope of the Program's objectives. A project can focus primarily on curriculum development, faculty internships, or one-on-one counseling. No one project is required to do every activity, and can even develop their own options. This flexibility makes it difficult to see outcome trends, but as shown above, the Program has been able to be consistently productive.

One additional activity that has been highlighted is the Board of Governors' Workforce Initiative, also described as "career ladders." This has been included as a separate activity for reporting expenditures beginning with 2002-2003, though many of the activities in the current *Education Code* for Economic and Workforce Development fit the intent of "career ladders."

Table 4

Financial Detail by Eligible Activity *Education Code* Section 88531	
Curriculum development, development of instructional packages, faculty mentorships, faculty and staff development, in-service training, credit and noncredit programs and courses that contribute to workforce skill development ... (*Education Code* section 88531, items enumerated as "a," "b," "c," and "h")	**$ 10,335,460**
Institutional support, professional development, ... (d)	**$ 5,921,300**
Acquisition of equipment to support the eligible activities ... (j)	**$ 3,433,281**
Subsidized student internships ... (i)	**$ 688,285**
"Career Ladders": offering integrated academic and vocational education and opportunities for continuing and lifelong learning, etc...	**$ 2,654,075**
One-on-one counseling, seminars, workshops, and conferences ... (f)	**$ 7,915,367**
Performance-improvement training. (g)	**$ 3,787,849**
The deployment of new methodologies, modes, and technologies ....(e)	**$ 2,307,267**
Marketing	**$ 2,702,732**
Other (includes indirect costs at 4%; capacity development, and activities that support the mission. The *Education Cod does not limit the types of activities to the "a" through "j" ones listed.*)	**$ 6,426,386**
Nursing Enrollments[6]	**$ 4,000,000**
Total	**$ 50,172,000**

[6] For a report on the $4 million augmentation to the Economic and Workforce Development Program for nursing enrollment growth, see the following section.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROGRESS ON THE $4 MILLION AUGMENTATION TO THE ECONOMIC AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR ENROLLMENT GROWTH FOR ASSOCIATE DEGREE (RN) PROGRAMS

As a result of AB 87 (2001), funds were authorized by the State of California to increase enrollments in community college nursing programs. The intent of the legislation was to respond to an identified nursing shortage by increasing the capacity of community college nursing programs and ultimately, increasing the number of licensed nurses. The funds that were allocated to colleges as a result of this plan provided the opportunity for Associate Degree Nursing Programs (ADN) to expand the number of students enrolled in their programs by a minimum of 10 for a two-year period. Two years provides sufficient time for a cohort of students to enter the nursing program and complete the course work required to take the licensure examination.

The legislature allocated $4 million through the Economic and Workforce Development Program's budget, and the funds were then allocated to 62 of 67 ADN programs to expand the number of enrollment opportunities for students. These funds are managed through the Vocational Education Unit. The ADN programs were required to expand by a minimum of 10 enrollment "slots". Program funding ranged from a minimum of $59,701 for 10 enrollment "slots" to $101,400 for 40 enrollment "slots". Colleges committed to expanding their programs by a total 834 enrollment "slots" for the two-year period that the funds are available.

As noted in the report *Educating California's Future Nursing Work Force* (AB 655), "Conservative estimates indicate California will have a shortfall of 25,000 nurses within six years if changes in the health industry and higher education do not occur. This shortfall will result in a public health crisis for the growing and aging population. The impending nursing shortage in California is unlike any the state has experienced in the past. Resting in the balance of California's nursing workforce planning is the quality of patient care. An insufficient supply of trained nurses threatens to jeopardize public health. Understaffed facilities that result in additional overtime work hours and increased workloads erode the attractiveness of the profession to those seeking to enter nursing and lead to greater attrition of current nurses. Effective workforce planning, adequate educational resources, and responsible employment practices can ensure the supply of RNs needed to provide care to California patients."

The report also discussed several issues of concern to the community colleges regarding the nursing shortage, some of which are: 1) enrollments at capacity in most areas of the state; 2) increased competition for clinical placement of students in health care facilities; 3) an apparent 25% attrition rate; 4) relatively high cost of nursing and allied health programs due to low faculty/student ratio; 5) expensive nature of equipment and supplies for "state of the art" instruction. The augmentation funds, which came to the community college ADN programs, will assist in developing strategies to address these issues. (For information, contact Barbara Whitney, Health Specialist, at (916) 322-5246).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ECONOMIC & WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

ADDENDUM TO FY 01-02 ANNUAL REPORT CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES ECONOMIC AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

April 23, 2003

INTRODUCTION

This report is in response to the fiscal year 2002-03 Budget Act for the Economic and Workforce Development Program for activities in fiscal year 2001-02. The Budget Act language recognizes that the requirements are a look back at the previous year, and that sufficient data may not have been collected. This report represents the initial attempt by Chancellor's Office at responding to the additional requirements using the data elements that we are currently collecting. The updated data collection system, which has been operation for one calendar year, will eventually provide more detailed information. For this report, where necessary, staff has used data that best represents the information requested. For example, for the "hours of performance-based training," data is provided that was collected on funds spent on performance-based training, and its industry match. This report addresses each of the Budget Act requirements in the tables that follow. The requirements may be summarized as follows:

A) Show the amount provided to each Economic Development regional center and each industry-driven regional education and training collaborative,
B) To the extent practicable, show the total number of hours of contract education services, performance-based training, credit and noncredit instruction.
C) Show the number of job placements created as a result of this program by Regional Center and Industry-Driven Regional Collaborative.

STAFF SUMMARY

Both Regional Centers and Industry-Driven Regional Collaboratives play significant, but very different roles in supporting the mission of economic and workforce development for community colleges. The new Budget Act reporting requirements attempt to set up a comparison of productivity between two types of funds that staff view as complementary, so that viewing the two funds as in competition may be too simplistic. This report does contrast the two, however, as required.

Regional Centers are the long-term infrastructure of the Economic and Workforce Development Program. This infrastructure gives the community college system the strength and stability to obtain additional resources such as endowments for nursing programs, facilities for advanced transportation, and major pieces of equipment for manufacturers such as the $40 million donation of robotics equipment from IBM to the Fresno City Center for Applied Competitive Technologies. In the 2000-2001 report, the Regional Centers reported over $61 million in additional resources, most of which was not match to the grants, but resources obtained in total by Regional Centers at the statewide initiative level. Over the years, the data has shown that the Regional Centers offer more instruction to employees, provide the majority of job placements, and business services, while continuing to advance curriculum and provide resources to the classroom. This analysis is also verified by the data collected and presented in the tables below.

Industry-Driven Regional Collaboratives (IDRC) contribute greatly to the mission by providing outreach to economically distressed areas, opportunities to colleges that are developing programs, and to address local projects. Because the funding is designed to be flexible, responsive, short-term, seed money to develop new programs, IDRCs are not intended to develop a stable infrastructure like that of the Regional Centers. These grants allow the colleges to be forward looking, while also addressing immediate needs. Both Regional Centers and Industry-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Driven Regional Collaboratives are necessary for the Economic and Workforce Development Program to remain effective.

SUMMARY TABLES

Several tables follow to respond to the requirements in the Budget Act. These tables include:

Table 1	Results Comparison between Regional Centers and Industry-Driven Regional Collaboratives
Table 2	Funds Provided To Each Regional Center
Table 3	Funding for Industry-Driven Regional Colloboratives by Strategic Priority Area/ Local Project Designation
Table 4	Regional Centers - Instruction Services Performance-based training, credit/non credit hours, and contract education hours
Table 5	Industry-Driven Regional Collaboratives - Instruction Services Performance-based training, credit/non credit hours, and contract education hours
Table 6	Regional Centers - Job Placements, Businesses Served, Employees Served
Table 7	Industry-Driven Regional Collaboratives - Job Placements, Businesses Served, Employees Served

Table 1 is a summary analysis of the subsequent tables, depicting a comparison between the Regional Centers when compared to the Industry-Driven Regional Colloboratives. From the this table we find the following:

- Regional Centers served 30% more students than IDRCs.
- Regional Centers conducted about the same number of credit/non-credit hours of instruction, but provided 13 times the number of contract education hours than the IDRCs.
- Regional Centers served 6 times the number of businesses, nearly 5 times the number of employees and contributed nearly 3 times the number of job placements as IDRC grants.
- In fiscal year 2001-2002, Regional Centers received 15% more funding than Industry-Driven Regional Colloboratives.
- A primary goal of IDRC grants is to get business and industry support and commitment. IDRC grants obtained about 46% more in total dollar match from business and industry.
- In the IDRC category, more grant dollars were spent on performance-based training, but they were matched by a lower ratio from business/industry when compared to the Regional Centers. That is, for every one-dollar spent on performance-based training by the Regional Centers, they obtained $4.44 from business/industry, while IDRC grants obtained $3.02.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1: Results Comparison between Regional Centers and Industry-Driven Regional Collaboratives		
	Regional Centers	**Industry-Driven Regional Collaboratives**
Funding by category	$19,624,000	$17,046,192
Total business and industry match by category	$11,302,730	$16,507,849
Funds spent on performance-based training	$ 1,096,790	$ 1,200,088
Business/industry match for performance-based training	$ 4,867,334	$ 3,629,834
Number of students served	35,655	27,673
Number of credit/non-credit hours reported	425,912	418,150
Number of contract education hours reported	511,282	38,012
Number of Job Placements reported	5,096	1,847
Number of businesses served	31,634	5,231
Number of employees served	6,759	14,532

A. FUNDING BY CATEGORY

Tables 2 and 3 below show the number of projects, funds per project, and the total funding in each Initiative category for the Regional Centers, and each subject area for the IDRC grants. Listed in Table 2 are two center projects that relate to specific Initiatives. One is the manufacturing technology collaborative; the other is the Mexico Trade Assistance Centers. The manufacturing technology collaborative is associated with the Centers for Applied Competitive Technologies. Fourteen of the eighteen the Mexico Trade Assistance Centers are co-located with Centers for International Trade (CITD), and the remaining four are linked to CITDs. Because of this linkage, the CITDs report activities and accomplishments for the Mexico Trade Assistance Centers.

Table 3 groups the Industry-Driven Regional Collaboratives by strategic priority area. College districts may also complete projects in subject areas that are determined by the local economy. For Table 3, this includes such subjects as hospitality and tourism, agriculture, and materials handling. Several districts that needed to develop their ability to conduct economic development activities were successful in competing for "capacity development" funding which may focus on a specific subject and develop relationships with local employers, unions and small businesses.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2: Funds Provided To Each Regional Center			
Regional Centers by Initiative	**No. of Projects**	**Funds per Center**	**Funding this category**
Advanced Transportation Technology Centers	10	$ 178,875	$ 1,788,750
Bio-Technologies Centers	6	$ 178,875	$ 1,073,250
Centers for Applied Competitive Technologies	12	$ 178,875	$ 2,146,500
Manufacturing Technology Collaborative	1	$ 159,475	$ 159,475
Centers for International Trade Development	14	$ 178,875	$ 2,504,250
Mexico Trade Centers	18	$ 116,000	$ 2,088,000
Business and Workforce Performance Improvement – Centers of Excellence	9	$ 178,875	$ 1,609,875
Regional Health Occupations Resource Centers	8	$ 178,875	$ 1,431,000
New Media/ Multimedia/ Entertainment Centers	6	$ 178,875	$ 1,073,250
Regional Environmental Business Resource and Assistance	6	$ 178,875	$ 1,073,250
Small Business Development Centers	18	$ 140,550	$ 2,529,900
Workplace Learning Resource Centers	12	$ 178,875	$ 2,146,500
			$ 19,624,000

Table 3: Funding for Industry-Driven Regional Colloboratives by Strategic Priority Area/ Local Project Designation			
Industry-Driven Regional Collaboratives	**No. of Projects**	**Average Grant**	**Funding this category**
Transportation/Automotive	7	$ 211,741	$ 1,482,185
Manufacturing/Engineering/GIS	13	$ 210,346	$ 2,734,492
Capacity Development	14	$ 49,065	$ 686,905
Health Care	11	$ 204,143	$ 2,245,578
Hospitality/Tourism	4	$ 312,046	$ 1,248,184
Information Technology	14	$ 243,856	$ 3,413,978
Multimedia/Animation	6	$ 184,251	$ 1,105,503
Small Business projects	5	$ 185,896	$ 929,482
Various local projects	16	$ 199,993	$ 3,199,885
			$ 17,046,192

B. INSTRUCTION SERVICES

Tables 4 and 5 that follow show a breakdown of the funding for performance-based training (including business/industry match), credit and non-credit hours, and contract education hours by Initiative for each Regional Center category, and by subject area for IDRC grants.

Table 4: Regional Centers - Instruction Services
Performance-based training, credit/non credit hours, and contract education hours

Regional Centers	Funds for Performance-Based Training	Match for Performance-Based Training	Students Served	Credit/ Non-credit hours	Contract Ed Hours
Advanced Transportation Technology Centers	$ 59,771	$ 130,000	4,905	25,920	4,682
Bio-Technologies Centers	$ 1,600		11,160	8,696	1,037
Centers for Applied Competitive Technologies	$ 449,643	$ 1,085,624	3,070	57,499	321,127
Centers for International Trade Development	$ 66,492	$ 223,040	640	1,109	4,218
Business and Workforce Performance	$ 287,278	$ 295,187	-	-	6,690
Regional Health Occupations Resource Centers	$ 166,998	$ 1,637,474	6,864	103,545	124,914
New Media/ Multimedia/ Entertainment	$ 15,447	$ 196,796	640	203,259	-
Regional Environmental Business Resource and Assistance Centers	$ 38,381	$ 260,908	379	23,568	6,255
Small Business Development Centers	$ 980	-	2,747	1,103	24
Workplace Learning Resource Centers	$ 10,200	$ 1,038,305	5,250	1,213	42,335
otals	**$ 1,096,790**	**$ 4,867,334**	**35,655**	**425,912**	**511,282**

Table 5: Industry-Driven Regional Collaboratives - Instruction Services
Performance-based training, credit/non credit hours, and contract education hours

Industry-Driven Regional Collaboratives	Funds for Performance-Based Training	Match for Performance-Based Training	Students Served	Credit/ Non-credit hours	Contract Ed Hours
Transportation/Automotive	$ 162,783	$ 815,948	1,222	47,386	4
Manufacturing/Engineering/GIS	$ 368,768	$ 1,059,056	3,308	18,023	904
Capacity Development	$ 5,000	-	907	3,663	1,562
Health Care	$ 77,954	$ 106,544	920	12,003	2,465
Hospitality/Tourism	$ 81,975	$ 5,000	890	244	-
Information Technology	$ 19,022	$ 572,936	17,482	276,049	853
Multimedia/Animation	-	-	1,043	43,386	-
Small Business projects	$ 232,351	$ 93,470	323	402	2,765
Various local projects	$ 252,235	$ 976,880	1,578	16,994	29,459
Totals	**$ 1,200,088**	**$ 3,629,834**	**27,673**	**418,150**	**38,012**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

C. JOB PLACEMENTS, BUSINESSES, AND EMPLOYEES SERVED

Table 6: Regional Centers
Job Placements, Businesses Served, Employees Served

Regional Centers	Job Placements	Businesses Served	Employees Served
Advanced Transportation Technology Centers	138	1,733	2,188
Bio-Technologies Centers	197	951	1,128
Centers for Applied Competitive Technologies	20	2,302	8,679
Centers for International Trade Development	745	3,370	4,589
Business and Workforce Performance Improvement	-	1,953	427
Regional Health Occupations Resource Centers	992	2,412	7,887
New Media/ Multimedia/ Entertainment Centers	20	188	480
Regional Environmental Business Resource and Assistance	68	593	18,232
Small Business Development Centers	2,882	17,791	13,123
Workplace Learning Resource Centers	34	341	10,026
Totals	**5,096**	**31,634**	**66,759**

Table 7: Industry-Driven Regional Collaboratives
Job Placements, Businesses Served, Employees Served

Industry-Driven Regional Collaboratives	Job Placements	Businesses Served	Employees Served
Transportation/Automotive	146	537	2,288
Manufacturing/Engineering/GIS	69	740	1,798
Capacity Development	-	175	937
Health Care	104	1,069	4,006
Hospitality/Tourism	80	198	701
Information Technology	739	333	2,075
Multimedia/Animation	5	101	407
Small Business projects	530	1,652	697
Various local projects	174	426	1,623
Totals	**1,847**	**5,231**	**14,532**

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

[X] This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

[ ] This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").